

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amtd. Dated: September 28, 2005  
Reply to final Office Action of June 29, 2005

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the Application, while claims 1-10 were rejected. Claims 1-3 have been amended. Fig. 2 of the Application discusses the features of Claims 1-3. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112*

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The word "coil-type spring" in Claims 1-3 has been changed into the word "coil spring". Fig. 2 of the application shows that the spring 37 has a coil spring. Therefore, Claims 1-3 comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and are definite to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

#### Claims 1-3 and 8-10

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijten et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,113,440 (hereinafter "Fijten") in view of Kfoury et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,049,192 (hereinafter "Kfoury") for the reasons stated on pages 3-7 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

The Examiner has stated on page 4 of the Office Action that Fijten does not specifically disclose a coil-spring biasing the plunger in the plunger housing against the bottom of the base cover member. The Examiner, however, has stated on page 8 of the Office

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amdt. Dated: September 28, 2005  
Reply to final Office Action of June 29, 2005

Action that Col. 8, lines 64-67 of Kfoury discloses that the battery charger further includes a coil spring positioned in the spring well.

Claim 1 is a battery connector for a mobile phone, installed in a main body of the mobile phone and contacting a battery terminal to supply power to a printed circuit board (PCB) of the mobile phone, the battery connector comprising: a body having a plurality of plunger housings; a plunger slidably installed in each of the plurality of plunger housings of the body; a base cover member having a cylindrical connection part fitted in a lower end of each of the plurality of plunger housings, a bottom surface of the base cover member adhered to the PCB by soldering and made of conductive material; and a coil spring biasing the plunger in the plunger housing against the bottom of the base cover member.

In contrast, Col. 3, lines 60-64 of Kfoury teaches that the bottom housing section 112 is assembled by receiving the door housing 104, springs 440 and 442, feet 493-496, and label 498; and the springs 440 and 442 provide bias to push the door housing 104 into the closed position for storage and transport. That is, the springs 440 and 442 are provided in the bottom housing section 112 of battery charger 103, rather than the contact block 420, which includes battery contacts 422 for connection to contacts 212 of battery 200 or contacts 310 of battery 300 (Col. 3, lines 41-43 of Kfoury). Therefore, the springs 440 and 442 biasing the door housing 104 is different from the coil spring biasing the plunger in the plunger housing against the bottom of the base cover member of the battery connector. Accordingly, Kfoury fails to teach or suggest the element "a coil spring biasing the plunger in the plunger housing against the bottom of the base cover member", as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over Fijten, in view of Kfoury, alone or in combination, because either Fijten or Kfoury fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. Since it contains similar features, Claim 2 is believed to be patentable over Fijten in view of Kfoury, alone or in combination for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

#### Claims 4-7

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijten and Kfoury further in view of Lok, U.S. Patent No. 6,068,519 (hereinafter "Lok") for the reasons stated on pages 7-10 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/081,080  
Amdt. Dated: September 28, 2005  
Reply to final Office Action of June 29, 2005

Lok fails to teach or suggest the elements "a coil spring disposed under the contact plunger inside the housing, for providing the contact plunger with elasticity and being made of conductive material", as recited in Claim 2. Therefore, Lok does not cure the deficiency of the combination of Fijten and Kfoury. Accordingly, the combination of Fijten, Kfoury, and Lok does not render Claim 2 obvious. Claims 4-7 depend from Claim 2, and thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claim 2.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Soonja Bae  
Limited Recognition No. L0017  
Confirmation No. 2344  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
PTO Customer No. 23413  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: September 28, 2005